

## **ROANOKE RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Chamber of Commerce Building  
1640 Julian R. Allsbrook Hwy.  
Roanoke Rapids, NC

**MARCH 25, 1998**

### **AGENDA**

9:00	Call to Order & Welcome	Mary Lilley, Acting Chairman
9:35	Self-Introductions	All
9:40	Acceptance of Minutes from 1-14-98 meeting	Mary Lilley
9:45	Election of Officers	Mary Lilley
10:00	Prioritization of Environmental Concerns: Correlation to CCMP	Guy Stefanski & Joan Giordano (Division of Water Quality)
11:00	BREAK	
11:10	DISCUSSION	Elected Chairman
	- Attendance concerns	
	- Coordinating Council meeting on 3/31	
	- Plans for upcoming meeting with facilitator	
	- Plans for next regular meeting	
12:00	Adjourn	



ROANOKE RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

March 25, 1998

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by the Acting Chairman, Mary Lilley. Also present at the meeting were:

Joan Giordano  
Guy Stefanski  
Lori Medlin  
James Outland  
Kay Winn  
Jerry Coker  
Jerry Holloman  
Jack Powell  
Michael Taylor  
Chuck Laughridge.

After the call to order and welcome, self-introductions were made.

The minutes of the January meeting were approved as read, following a motion for approval by Jack Powell and second by Mike Taylor.

First order of business was the election of officers. A slate of proposed officers was presented from the last meeting. They are as follows:

Mary Lilley, Chairman  
Chuck Laughridge, Vice-Chairman  
Kay Winn, Secretary-Treasurer.

Motion was made by Jack Powell and seconded by Jerry <sup>Holloman</sup>~~Coker~~ that the proposed slate of officers be elected. The consensus of the group was in agreement with the motion.

Mary Lilley announced that she, Jerry Coker, and Andy Allen were planning to serve on the Coordinating Council, and that the meeting of the council is scheduled for March 31. She is supposed to give a ten-minute presentation on our progress to the Council at that meeting.

Joan Giordano then explained that a special meeting with a facilitator will be held on April 24, during which our prioritization of concerns will be developed into a Program of Work. There will be a competitive grant process within each council for projects. There is an even amount of money to be provided to each council for these grants, but the exact process for formulation and award of the money has not yet been devised. It is hoped that local governments, organizations, and others will participate in the design and implementation of projects which will address the concerns as expressed in our Program of Work.



The Chairman then asked what part of the basin we are supposed to focus upon, whether to exclude the areas above the dams, or to include that area with the rest of the basin. The ensuing discussion reflected several differing points of view and possible definitions, with the final determination being to accept the definition of the area of concern as given in the Executive Order. Further suggestion was made by the Chairman that we try to find out if Virginia is conducting efforts similar to ours, since much of the Roanoke River lies there.

The Chairman and Jerry Holloman also expressed a desire for the group to meet with Terry Brown of the Corps of Engineers (Wilmington), as they had attended a meeting in January where he had explained much of what goes into the decisions of the Corps.

Taking the outline of concerns from the breakout session at Plymouth, the group engaged in the process of prioritization of those concerns. After much discussion and debate, the consensus of the group as to the priorities was achieved, and is as follows:

### Prioritization of Environmental Concerns

#### 1. Flow Regulation

- a) Aseasonal flows
- b) Partnership with Corps of Engineers
- c) Water withdrawal issues\*
- c) Impact on habitats\*
  - \*These two issues being seen as equally important
- e) Impacts on land use

#### 2. Water Quality

- a) Dissolved oxygen
- b) Nutrient load
- c) Sedimentation
- d) Toxins
- e) Land use/planning

#### 3. Stewardship

- a) Economic/ tourism development
- b) Rights and responsibilities of riparian landowners
- c) Education
- d) Incentives/cost-share

It was noted that the issues of public access to the river may also need to be addressed.

Guy Stefanski and Joan Giordano will take the results and correlate them with the CCMP for use at the April meeting with the facilitator.



Discussion items included attendance concerns and several pieces of information of interest.

Jack Powell raised the concern that some members have work conflicts, especially with the upcoming crop season. Members were reminded that they may use a proxy, provided that it is sent to one of the officers or DWQ staff members in writing by the meeting time. After a brief review of attendance patterns, Chuck Laughridge suggested that the Chairman write to those who have not been in regular attendance to ask their intentions. It was also agreed that the Chairman could refer to the Bylaws of the Council, citing Page 5, Article III, Section 5, Attendance, in that letter.

The next meeting will be April 24, at a time and place to be determined by the Chairman and Staff, so as to best use the time of the facilitator.

The Chairman has information on canoe trails on the river.

Jerry Holloman will soon be able to provide the Internet address where data from the five continuous water quality monitoring stations will be available in real time in a month or so.

Chuck Laughridge suggested that the Council might consider making a short (5-7 minute) videotaped presentation of the points of our final product so that a quick overview may be obtained by legislators and others.

Kay Winn informed the Council that Roanoke-Chowan Community College has proposed a new program of study in environmental technology for the fall semester.

The next regular meeting of the Council will be held on May 27, with time and location to be announced later.

With no other business to address, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kay Winn, Secretary



## **ROANOKE RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL**

*What are the priority environmental concerns in your river basin?*

*Members of the Roanoke River Basin Regional Council have developed a list of priority environmental concerns for the Roanoke River Basin. This list was determined by members during their regular meeting on March 25, 1998.*

**The RRBRC determined that “water flow” connects to every issue in the Roanoke River Basin. Water quality and flow go hand-in-hand. There is also an emphasis by the RRBRC to contact Congressional leaders to let them know what is going on at the local level.**

The RRBRC developed (3) broad categories of priority concerns and listed specific issues related to that category. Below are the RRBRC’s priority environmental concerns as correlated to the main goals, objectives and management actions of the CCMP:

### **PRIORITY CONCERN #1. FLOW REGULATION**

1. Aseasonal flows
2. Develop partnership with Army Corps of Engineers
- 3(tie). Water withdrawals
- 3(tie). Impact on habitats
5. Impacts on land use

### **PRIORITY CONCERN #2. WATER QUALITY**

1. Dissolved oxygen levels
2. Nutrient loads from point and nonpoint sources
3. Sedimentation impacts
4. Toxins
5. Land use & land use planning

### **PRIORITY CONCERN #3. STEWARDSHIP**

1. Economic/tourism development
2. Landowner rights and responsibilities
3. Enhanced education efforts
4. Promote more incentives/cost-share initiatives

### **PRIORITY CONCERN #1. FLOW REGULATION**

Many of the issues presented by the RRBRC within the #1 Flow Regulation and #2 Water Quality categories, can be addressed by management strategies in the CCMPs Water Quality Plan, particularly with the development of basinwide management plans. Aseasonal flows, water withdrawals, dissolved oxygen levels, nutrient loads, sedimentation and toxic issues are discussed in the September 1996 Roanoke River Plan.

The CCMP’s Water Quality Plan offers many strategies designed to “restore, maintain or enhance water quality”. Specifically, Objective A, Management Action 1, Critical Step #2 (pg. 29) says that the Regional Councils shall have input into the basinwide planning process.



Objective A: Implement a comprehensive basinwide approach to water quality management.

Management Action 1: Develop and begin implementing basinwide plans to protect and restore water quality in each basin according to the schedule established by the Division of Water Quality. The plans would include provisions for basinwide wetland protection and restoration.

The RRBRC seeks a partnership/relationship with the Army Corps of Engineers to further discuss their flow regulation concerns. Members of the Coordinating Council (Implementation Plan, Objective A, Management Action 2, Critical Step #1 (pg. 166) include representatives from the RRBRC and the COE. The RRBRC should be encouraged to discuss these issues with the Corps through this Coordinating Council format.

The RRBRC is also concerned with the effects of flow regulation on habitats. This could best be addressed through the CCMP's Vital Habitats Plan.

Objective A: Promote regional planning to protect and restore the natural heritage of the APES region.

Management Action 1: Develop ecosystem protection and restoration plans (basinwide ecosystem plans) for each river basin in the region. **NOTE: Critical Step #1 (pg. 84) indicates that the Regional Councils would have input into developing these plans.**

## **PRIORITY CONCERN #2. WATER QUALITY**

### **1. Dissolved oxygen levels**

Are the result of something causing the water quality conditions to change. We can track changes in water quality through comprehensive monitoring efforts.

### **WATER QUALITY PLAN**

**Goal: Restore, maintain or enhance water quality in the Albemarle-Pamlico region so that it is fit for fish, wildlife and recreation.**

Objective A: Implement a comprehensive basinwide approach to water quality management.

Management Action 6. Continue long-term, comprehensive monitoring of water quality in the APES system, collecting data to assess general system health and target restoration problems.

### **2. Nutrient loads from point and nonpoint sources.**

### **3. Sedimentation impacts**

### **4. Toxins**

The CCMP contains three objectives addressing pollution to surface water and ground water from nutrient loads, sedimentation and toxics. Objective B focuses on the reduction and control of pollutants from nonpoint sources; while Objective C targets reductions from point sources. Objective E seeks to reduce the risk of toxic contamination to human health and the ecosystem. From the actions presented below, the RRBRC should consider which are most amenable in addressing their primary concerns related to this issue.



According to the CCMP (pg. 42), Objective B, Management Action 1, Critical Step #1: *“The Department of Environment & Natural Resources, in cooperation with state and federal agencies, the Regional Councils, universities, and other members of the public and private sector, will develop a comprehensive nonpoint source control plan specific to each river basin”*.

This action should be considered as the overall theme to addressing the concerns listed above. The following three objectives from the CCMP contain specific management actions that recommend ways to control pollution from point & nonpoint sources, including sediment and toxics.

Objective B: Reduce sediments, nutrients and toxicants from nonpoint sources.

Management Action 2: Expand funding to implement nonpoint source pollution controls, particularly agricultural best management practices through the NC Agriculture Cost Share Program, and also to develop a broader Water Quality Cost Share Program. Expand the cost share programs to include wetlands restoration. Increase cost share funds to problem areas.

Management Action 3: Continue to research and develop alternative septic systems and new best management practices to reduce nonpoint source pollution.

Management Action 4: Strengthen current enforcement to detect and correct ground and surface water quality violations from nonpoint sources.

Management Action 5: Strengthen implementation of forestry best management practices through training, education, technical assistance and enforcement.

Management Action 6: Enhance stormwater runoff by strengthening existing regulations and developing new ones, if needed, by 1995. Improve enforcement to ensure that stormwater management systems are properly installed and regularly maintained.

Objective C: Reduce pollution from point sources, such as wastewater treatment facilities and industry.

Management Action 1: Promote pollution prevention planning and alternatives to discharge, where feasible, for all point sources to reduce the volume and toxicity of discharges.

Management Action 2: Expand and strengthen enforcement of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits. Increase site inspections and review of self-monitoring data to improve facility compliance by 1995.

Objective D. Reduce the risk of toxic contamination to aquatic life and human health.

Management Action 1: Increase efforts to assess and monitor the extent of estuarine sediment contamination, fish and shellfish tissue contamination, and water quality violations, and to identify the causes and sources of these problems.

**5. Land use & land use planning** (this is addressed below under the CCMP’s Stewardship Plan, Objective A).



### **PRIORITY CONCERN #3. STEWARDSHIP**

- 1. Economic/tourism development**
- 4. Promote more incentives/cost-share initiatives**

These priority concerns can be addressed by the CCMP's Stewardship Plan, particularly through the management actions presented in Objective A.

#### **STEWARDSHIP PLAN**

**Goal: Promote responsible stewardship of the natural resources of the Albemarle-Pamlico region.**

Objective A: Promote local and regional planning that protects the environment and allows for economic growth.

Management Action 1: Support local planning by providing funding and economic incentives to local governments to integrate environmental and economic planning by 1999.

Management Action 4: Provide support to organizations that promote nature-based tourism and environmental education as a way of fostering environmentally sound economic development in the region.

- 2. Landowner rights and responsibilities**
- 3. Enhanced education efforts**

Enhancing the landowner's knowledge of his/her rights and responsibilities could best be achieved through better education and information opportunities. The following management actions focus on ways to better inform the public.

Objective B: Increase public understanding of environmental issues and citizen involvement in environmental policy making.

Management Action 1: Expand and coordinate education projects about the Albemarle-Pamlico estuary, focusing on both environmental and economic issues.

Management Action 2: Increase opportunities for citizens to communicate with members of environmental agencies and policy-making commissions.

Management Action 3: Enhance and heighten local public involvement in issues affecting the estuary.

Management Action 4: Expand involvement in the Citizens Water Quality Monitoring Program and make the program more interactive with regulatory agencies.

Objective C: Ensure that students, particularly in grades K-5, are exposed to science and environmental education.



Management Action 1: Support the development of a comprehensive environmental science and education curriculum.

Management Action 2: Provide for teachers at all levels ongoing opportunities to gain renewal credits in workshops on environmental and estuarine education.

April 17, 1998.



## ROANOKE RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL

*What are the priority environmental concerns in your river basin?*

*Members of the Roanoke River Basin Regional Council have developed a list of priority environmental concerns for the Roanoke River Basin. This list originated during a break-out session at the September 25, 1997 Regional Councils "Kick-off" Meeting, and was expanded upon during their regular meetings on November 17, 1997 and January 14, 1998.*

**The RRBRC determined that "water flow" connects to every issue in the Roanoke River Basin. Water quality and flow go hand-in-hand. There is also an emphasis by the RRBRC to contact Congressional leaders to let them know what is going on at the local level.**

### PROBLEM STATEMENT #1: ADDRESS CONCERNS OVER WITHDRAWALS FROM AND FLOW RATES OF THE ROANOKE RIVER (EXAMPLE: LAKE GASTON PIPELINE).

- flow regulation
- amount of water taken from up-stream
- controlling water levels
- water in our basin should be controlled and left in our basin
- asynchronous river flows
- work/coordinate with Army Corps of Engineers on flow issues
- proximity to large, populated areas without enough water resources of their own (Gaston pipeline)

### PROBLEM STATEMENT #2: ADDRESS PROBLEMS OF PRIVATE AND MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT.

- improve sewage treatment facilities
- we definitely need cost-effective alternative septic systems
- incorporate new industrial technology
- improving municipal wastewater (systems are ill-managed, in disrepair)

### PROBLEM STATEMENT #3: ADDRESS ISSUES/ACTIVITIES DETRIMENTAL TO WATER QUALITY.

- control amount of sedimentation
- improve water color
- At what water-flow could the river become "nutrient sensitive"?
- ensure water flow to prevent toxic build up
- determine the quality of the rivers & streams going into the river
- industrial draws & discharges -- paper mills form "cone of depression", pollute w/ dioxin
- work to eliminate/improve operations of poorly operated auto graveyards, etc (which introduce oils, etc. to groundwater)
- flow from areas not under our jurisdiction -- Virginia regulations .... better or worse?

### PROBLEM STATEMENT #4: ADDRESS AGRICULTURE AND SILVICULTURE PRACTICES WHICH AFFECT WATER QUALITY.

- need to seek out new farming practices that conserves soil, water and nutrients
- economic inducements to clear-cut alternatives
- impacts of wooded swamp alterations (drainage/restoration enhancements)
- Are silviculture BMPs being used? Are they working?



- maintain vegetation cover (critical to protecting river drainages)
- protection of wildlife
- continue to encourage good stewardship with AG Cost Shares .... extend to industry & forestry
- restore healthy fish stocks
- prevent fish kills
- an understanding of nonpoint source pollution (status/comparative degree of impact)
- ensure that all animal waste operations are certified as required

**PROBLEM STATEMENT #5: ADDRESS RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF RIPARIAN LANDOWNERS.**

- come to grips .... focus attention on interbasin transfers
- make the case for rights of down-river riparian landowners
- protect riparian rights
- moratorium will activate "law of unintended consequences" ..... counter productive.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT #6: ADDRESS PROJECTED GROWTH AND ITS IMPACTS.**

- properly plan for population growth and human impacts
- economic growth should be watched and controlled
- long-range plan for future expansion of industry or agriculture
- limit population growth or charge impact fees
- Is there enough water for economic development?

**PROBLEM STATEMENT #7: ADDRESS EDUCATION OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT USES & OPPORTUNITIES OF ROANOKE RIVER.**

- educate citizens & governments to make more recycling/reduction strategies a part of the plan
- teach our children to value environment without making them fearful

March 25, 1998

